DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 147 335 TM 006 643

AUTHOR Reed, Horace B.
TITLE Evaluation of Alternative Approaches to Teacher Preparation.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 38p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Teachers; College Graduates; Data Analysis; *Educational Alternatives; Educational Programs; *Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; *Preservice Education; Program Attitudes; *Program Evaluation; *Teacher Education; Teacher Persistence; Vocational Followup
IDENTIFIERS University of Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

Two hundred seventy-one graduates of 19 University of Massachusetts alternative teacher preparation programs rated these alternative programs on 48 variables. Questions on training, classroom teaching experience, program affiliation, and current employment status were included. The hypothesis that students who were enrolled in different teacher education programs would have distinguishable differences in attitude, employment experience, and so on, was supported. The graduates tended to agree on their perceptions of each program, but differed greatly on whether these program characteristics were rated favorably or unfavorably. The results are briefly compared to the findings of a similar study conducted among the previous year's graduates. Tabular data which present the overall results of the questionnaire, as well as a comparative analysis of the program variables, are appended. (Author/HV)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED147335

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Horace B. Reed

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Evaluation of Alternative Approaches to Teacher Preparation

by
Horace B. Reed

School of Education
University of Massachusetts

1975

TM006 643

Evaluation of Alternative Approaches
to Teacher Preparation

Abstract

Data from 271 graduates of nineteen alternative teacher preparation programs was gathered to evaluate these programs, using a questionnaire with 26 preservice and 17 inservice variables. The alternatives approach to teacher preparation hypothesizes distinguishable differences in designs and implementations. This study supports that position: graduates, all from the same University, tend to agree on their perceptions of each program, and distinguish markedly among programs concerning high and low characteristics. The School of Education uses this information in decisions affecting the operations and existence of current programs, as well as directing future efforts in pre- and inservice designs.

Introduction

At the School of Education, University of Massachusetts, there are over nineteen differing models for preservice teacher education. These models vary in a number of different ways: as to goals; types of program components; target populations; rationals; social-philosophical orientations; etc. Evaluation results of these programs are used for discussions concerning improvements; and as one guide for possibly redirecting or enlarging or combining programs.

One useful source of data for the evaluation of teacher education is the perceptions of program graduates. This report presents the evaluations of several alternative approaches to teacher preparation, using graduates' judgements several months after they have completed their preparation.

Design

The study includes nineteen different teacher preparation programs, and the students who graduated in June of 1974. All the programs operate under a Teacher Education Council (TEC) at one University. Thus comparisons among programs are made without having to account for differences due to the sponsoring institutions.

The analysis is based on data generated from a questionnaire mailed to graduates in the late Fall after their June graduation. This permits gaining information on present employment status, and on perceptions of their preservice experiences, as well as their present employment experiences.

Analysis is presented of the total sample, as well as differences among programs. Data on 48 variables is available.

Comparison is made with the results of a similar study, made for the graduates of 1973.

Questionnaire

The items for the questionnaire represent contributions from ideas and thoughtful criticisms of several scores of professionals, doctoral students, and respondents over the past three years of similar evaluations. The present form contains three sets of items or variables. One set of 26 variables relates to preservice questions; another set refers to present teaching (inservice) items; the third set focuses on information about program affiliation, employment status, etc. See Table A for a reproduction of the specific items.

An example of one of the 26 preservice variables asks the graduate to:

> Please rate the quality of training you received from your preparation program in:
>
> Sexism in the classroom and school.
>
1._____	2._____	3._____	4._____	5._____	6._____
very poor	poor	fair	good	excel-lent	none

Sample

In the late Fall of 1974, the questionnaire was mailed to 647 graduates of 1974 of the nineteen TEC undergraduate programs. Of these a 45% response was obtained. In a previous study (1972), a special check on those who did not respond showed no

major differences with those responding, in average responses on selected variables. The 271 responses were from 200 female (74%) and 71 male (26%). There were sufficient numbers of responses by programs to permit cross program analysis for 14 of the 19 programs (those with an n of 8 or more).

Results from the Total Sample

Employment Data (Totals)

Information concerning employment status and other general data was collected using several job categories (see Table A, item 30). Fifty percent are working in some form of teaching: 27% as full-time teachers; 21% as part-time or paraprofessionals; and 2% teaching in a non-school setting. An additional 5% are working in a non-teaching educational field; 8% are in graduate or other school; and 3% are not involved in any of the above.

In the 1973 study, there were fewer job categories used; 53% indicated a teaching status, but there was no attempt in that study to distinguish between full and part time; 4% were in gradaute school.

The 1974 sample is made up of 74% females and 26% males; the 1973 sample was 71% females and 29% males.

An item designed to gain information on reasons for the "not teaching" responses indicated that 16% of the total sample decided that they did not want to teach at this time, compared with 11% in the 1973 study. Twenty-five percent

of the 1974 study reported they wanted to teach, but could not find a position or could not find one they were willing to accept; this compares with 28% for the 1973 study.

To check on whether "teaching" or "not teaching" status might bias graduates' perceptions of their programs, a Chi square analysis was made. Only three preservice variables of the 26 are slightly significantly different for these two subsamples: UMass Supervision, Local School Supervision, and Sexism (at .04 to .06 level of significance). There seems to be no major preservice contamination of the data related to employment status.

High and Low Rated Preservice Variables (Totals)

The total sample means and standard deviations for the items of the questionnaire appear in Table A. Table C highlights those preservice items for the total sample that are at the lower and higher ends of the scale (range of 1 to 5). To gain a framework for comparing items, we have selected mean scores from 1 to 2.99 as indicating relatively poor assessments for an item; from 3.0 to 3.49 as moderate or adequate; and from 3.5 to 5.0 as relatively good. This selection of cutting points is intentionally conservative; we reasoned that 3.0 (which is labeled as "fair" or "some") is only faint praise, and that we should want somewhat more positive perceptions than the 3.0 midpoint represents.

Of the 26 preservice variables, 5 are perceived as relatively poor (Foundations, Cognitive Knowledge, Racism, Sexism, Help Selecting Program). Nine variables are rated as good (Undergraduate Experience, Student Teaching,

Communications Skills, School Supervision, TEC Program, Interpersonal Knowledge, Individual Differences, Setting Own Goals, Self Evaluation -- 2 of these are just below the 3.50 mean). The remaining 12 items fall into the middle or fair range.

With few exceptions, this pattern of high and low rating of items is similar to the study of the 1973 graduates, with the 1973 study showing 3 more variables in the poor category, and 1 less in the good. There is a small, but overall consistency (23 out of 26 variables), for the 1974 graduates to perceive their preservice experiences as higher in quality than did the 1973 graduates. This suggests that on the whole the School of Education is doing a more effective job. The data also suggests that programs continue to find it difficult to do well in the few areas indicated, and are experiencing more success with a larger number of efforts.

Another overview of the total sample is presented in Tables D and E. These tabulate data from the 14 larger programs where 50% or more of the responses fall in either the good/excellent, or very poor/poor scale categories for each of the 26 preservice variables. There are 364 cells (14 x 26) formed: a program by variables matrix. In Table D, there are 176 cells (48% of the 364 possible) for the total sample that indicate strength in the School of Education teacher preparation efforts, since these are in the good/excellent category. On the lower end of the scales (Table E), only 40 cells (11% of the 364 possible) are perceived as very poor/poor. In the analysis of separate programs, it will be clear that there is considerable unevenness in the strengths and weaknesses among

programs, with several being perceived as more consistently strong, and some as tending towards the lower end of the scale.

Inservice Variables (Totals)

In the 1974 study, on the 17 inservice variables (Table A) there are 15 for which rough comparisons can be made between similarily worded preservice items. On 10 of these, graduates perceived their present inservice performance more highly than their preservice preparation. But on 5 items, they reverse this pattern and see their present teaching as lower (Racism, Sexism, Social Change, Setting Own Goals, Beliefs and Goals). There are probably several reasons for this shift for all 5 of these variables, having to do with adverse conditions in the schools, graduates' feelings of inadequacies, and graduates' disagreement with the values inherent in the variables.

Comparisons on the inservice variables for the 1973 and 1974 studies are confounded by the fact that in the 1974 study we altered the adjectives used on the item scales, so as to shift the means more towards the middle. In the 1973 study, there was a strong trend toward the upper parts of the scale. Even so, there are 8 inservice items that 1974 graduates perceive as stronger than did those reporting in 1973. Of particular interest are the variables where there is a notable increase in magnitude: Personal Knowledge, Racism, Sexism, Individual Students, Belief in Goals.

Inservice item #47 asks for the graduate's estimate concerning staff attitudes of the school system toward the educational beliefs encouraged by the

graduate's TEC program. In the 1973 study, we used the words "staff believes in," and in the 1974 study, we used "staff tolerates." There was a very marked change in mean scores on this item between the two years, from 2.41 for 1973 to 3.25 for 1974.

"No Opportunity" Response

For 11 of the preservice variables, there was a place for respondents to indicate they had "no opportunity" to receive instruction (Table A). For 5 items, 8 to 11% so indicated: Lesson/Curriculum Planning, Classroom Management, Ways to Evaluate Learners, Communicating Skills, UMass Supervision. This seems a reasonable finding, since there are programs that intentionally place little or no emphasis on one or more of these variables.

For 10 of the inservice variables there was a response place of "no opportunity" to demonstrate performance of the variable. In 4 of these, 6 to 10% so indicated: Racism, Sexism, Various Backgrounds, Social Change. This might suggest a somewhat restricted interpretation by some graduates of what the opportunities are in any classroom to address these variables.

Analysis by Programs

Employment Data (Programs)

The employment data for all the 19 programs is presented in Table H. Among the 14 larger programs with responses of 8 or more, Reading, Secondary English, and Secondary Math all indicate a 50% full-time teaching record, with Amherst

Elementary at 46%. These are well above the total sample of 27%. Combining the full, part-time/paraprofessional and non-school teaching categories, Reading has by far the highest placement (89%), then Amherst Elementary (69%) and Urban Education (60%): all are well above the total sample of 50% for the three categories.

There is no evidence of a positive relationship between graduates' assessments of their programs and employment data for those graduates. If anything, there is the suggestion of a negative relationship. Of the 4 programs with highest records for full-time teaching, 3 are perceived as low on many preservice variables.

The program with the lowest teaching employment record (the first 3 categories) is Secondary Social Studies with only 1 out of 12 teaching (8%). Secondary Science is the next lowest with 36%; Explorations, Future Studies, Off Campus, Eleven Plus have around 40%.

High and Low Rated Variables (Programs)

Graduates from the 14 larger programs perceive their preservice experience quite differently. A Chi square analysis demonstrates significant differences among programs on 22 out of the 26 preservice variables: 1 at the .06 level of significance; 6 at .01 to .03 levels; 15 at .009 to .0001 levels. This finding is very similar for the 1974 and 1973 studies.

The 3 preservice variables that were perceived in a uniform way across programs are Student Teaching, Local School Supervision, and Selecting a Program.

The Cognitive Knowledge variable might be included here since it was only significant at the .08 level.

Information on pre and inservice variables concerning each program is available by looking in varied ways at the data. In Table F, the 14 larger programs are compared, using the percentage of responses in the optimum (good/excellent) range of the scales measuring the variables. With the percentage for the total as a base of zero, a plus or minus deviation from zero was figured for each program on each variable. A count was made of those preservice variables for a program where the magnitude of variation was ± 15% or more. A count was also made of all the plus and minus percentages among the 26 preservice variables for each program. These countings are presented in Table G.

Another way of presenting the data is shown in Tables D and E. These identify the preservice variables for each program where 50% or more of responses are in either the good/excellent or very poor/poor ends of the scales. A count of these by programs is presented in Table G. This differs from the first approach (± 15% standard) in that it reduces emphasis on comparing programs directly, and focuses more on high or low ratings within each program, independently of other programs.

From Table G, the 2 programs with highest overall ratings are Explorations and TEPAM, followed closely by TASP. Also fairly strong are METEP, Eleven Plus, Secondary English, and Urban Education.

Also from Table G, Amherst Elementary, Off Campus, Secondary Science and Secondary Math receive relatively low ratings on many variables and high on very few. Future Studies and Reading also are perceived more negatively. Secondary Social Studies ranks on the low side in the comparison tables, and is about in the middle on the other form of analysis.

Three of the 4 secondary academic programs are perceived as having large numbers of negative ratings. This is apparently not just a reflection of the factor of these graduates being majors from outside the School of Education, since the Secondary English program does not fit the pattern of the other 3.

Inservice Variables (Programs)

Comparing programs on the 17 inservice variables provides only limited information. First, only 2 of the variables differentiate significantly among the 14 programs (Sexism and Racism). Secondly, the number of respondents (those teaching) are quite small for several programs. Among those with larger number of responses, only TEPAM and Explorations seemed to deviate very much from the total of the 14 programs in Table F. For TEPAM there are 3 positive and 5 negative graduates' assessments of their inservice teaching that go beyond the $\pm$ 15% standard. Perhaps the fact that the TEPAM respondents perceived their preservice experience in self-evaluation (See Table F, item 27) as very high in emphasis, may be related to their distinguishing more critically concerning their present teaching competencies.

For Explorations there are 10 inservice variables, all 15% or more above (positive) the total average. Thus, these graduates perceive both their pre-

service experience and their present teaching as unusually strong.

Conclusions

Several cautions should be noted in using the information (and our interpretations) of this study.

There are the limits discussed above regarding the size and representativeness of the total sample and program subsamples.

The data source is graduates' perceptions. While there is strong agreement among graduates that almost all preservice items significantly differentiate among programs, it is still necessary to caution that self-reports may have unknown built-in biases that tilt data. Other sources of information should be referred to as a way of putting self-report data into a wider context.

When examining items that differentiate among programs, the reader is reminded that programs may intentionally differ as to how much importance they attribute to various items. Thus a low rating by graduates of a program on a specific item may be expected, and be of little importance, so far as that program is concerned.

Many of the items are relatively abstract. They provide a very generalized form of information. In some instances the data may be useful largely as clues to several additional more specific questions that could be investigated.

Keeping in mind these limitations, there are several general observations that seem warranted.

It is quite clear that students who have completed their work with one of the various alternative teacher preparation programs, perceive their experiences in very different ways on a large number of preservice variables. Those from a given program tend to agree on their perceptions of its strengths and weaknesses. And across programs graduates distinguish sharply concerning the high and low characteristics of programs.

Some programs are perceived as relatively high, and others are seen as relatively low on almost all preservice variables.

A few variables are rated as fairly high and a few others as fairly low for almost all programs.

The full-time employment rate is hardly encouraging. Yet this generalization must be tempered with the fact that a more generous description of employment gives a less dismal picture. And it is also worth noting that a sizeable group did not wish to be involved in teaching at this time.

There was a large measure of consistency in the overall results of the 1973 and the 1974 studies with some marked changes up or down among separate programs.

In general, the 1974 graduates tended to provide a slightly higher rating

of variables than did the 1973 graduates regardless of program differences.

Finally, for the total 1974 sample, graduates perceive far fewer weaknesses and many more strengths on the preservice variables.

The data generated from this study is currently proving helpful in the decisions for future designs and implementations of the alternative approaches to teacher education. Underway now are studies that tap the perceptions of school employers of our graduates. And evaluations are in progress for the new thrust towards an alternative approach to inservice teacher education.

Bibliography

Clark, Richard; Love, Barbara; and Reed, Horace. "Special Feature: Teacher Education". Meforum: Responses to Issues in Education, 1:17-74 (Fall 1974).

Reed, Horace and Hatch, John. "An Analysis of Post Graduation Status of 1972 Teacher Preparation Studies". In-House Manuscript, 1973.

Reed, Horace and Schniedewind, Nancy. "An Evaluation of Alternative Teacher Education Programs". In-House Manuscript, 1974.

Reed, Horace and Raynor, Tom. "Teacher Preparation Programs and Employment as Perceived by 1974 Graduates". In-House Manuscript, 1975.

Table A Questionnaire Items with Means and Standard Deviations, Total Sample

Item

2. Sex

(1) female (2) male

Number = 200 (74%) Number = 71 (26%)

4. Other than your teacher preparation program, how would you rate the quality of your undergraduate education:

1 _____ very poor 2 _____ poor 3 _____ fair 4 _____ good 5 _____ excellent

Mean (M) - 3.86 Standard Deviation (SD) - .65

Please rate, for questions 5-15, the quality of training you received from your preparation program in the following areas or skills.

Use the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6
very poor	poor	fair	good	excellent	none

5. Methods course/training

M - 3.10 SD - 1.10

6. Educational psychology (or similar) course/training

M - 3.35 SD - 1.14

7. Foundations course/training

M - 2.95 SD - 1.15

8. Student teaching experience

M - 4.43 SD - .79

9. Lesson/curriculum planning

M - 3.14 SD - 1.21

10. Classroom management

M - 3.23 SD - 1.15

11. Ways to evaluate learners

M - 3.07 SD - 1.10

12. Communicating skills

M - 3.47 SD - 1.06

13. Supervision from UMass supervisor while student teaching

M - 3.21 SD - 1.49

14. Supervision from local school cooperating teacher while student teaching

M - 4.16 SD - 1.11

15. Overall quality of your teacher preparation program

M - 3.48 SD - .99

Please indicate, for questions 16-18, the degree of emphasis your preparation program placed on your gaining the following types of learnings.

Use the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
almost no emphasis	a little	some	much	very much emphasis

16. Cognitive (subject matter or factual knowledge)

M - 2.79 SD - 1.08

17. Interpersonal (knowledge about your interactions and relationships with other people)

M - 3.64 SD - 1.06

18. Personal (knowledge about yourself)

M - 3.38 SD - 1.20

Please indicate, for questions 19-23, the degree of emphasis your preparation program placed on training you to deal with the following areas or situations.

Use the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
almost no emphasis	a little	some	much	very much emphasis

19. Racism in the classroom and school

M - 2.84 SD - 1.33

20. Sexism in the classroom and school

M - 2.75 SD - 1.21

21. Issues of social change in the school, community, and nation

M - 3.06 SD - 1.18

22. Understanding and teaching students of various social, economic, and cultural backgrounds

M - 3.10 SD - 1.28

23. Relating teaching to the concerns and experiences of individual students

M - 3.65 SD - 1.12

Please indicate, for questions 24-29, the degree to which you experienced the following in your preparation program.

Use the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
almost none	a little	some	much	very much

24. Support, personal help, advice from the staff of the program

M - 3.32 SD - 1.22

25. Efforts to relate theory and practice components of your preparation program

M - 3.01 SD - 1.12

26. Decision-making power to set my own goals and choose my own methods for reaching goals

M - 3.63 SD - 1.13

27. Self-evaluation of learning experience

M - 3.61 SD - 1.07

28. Personal agreement with the education beliefs favored by your preparation program

M - 3.38 SD - 1.14

29. Help in selecting or getting into a preparation program

M - 2.43 SD - 1.24

Section II

Questions About Present Status

30. Are you presently teaching:

(1)	Full-time school teaching	(27%)
(2)	Part-time school teaching or paraprofessional work	(21%)
(3)	Teaching in a non-school setting	(2%)
(4)	Working in an education field but not teaching	(5%)
(5)	Enrolled in a graduate or other school	(8%)
(6)	Not involved in any of the above	(37%)

For those whose work currently involves some form of teaching, please respond to questions 31 to 49, except for 48. Others, please answer questions 48 and 49.

Please rate for questions 31-34, the quality of your demonstration of the following skills in your present teaching.

Use the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
somewhat poor	fair	fairly good	very good	excellent

31. Lesson/curriculum planning

M - 3.27 SD - .93

32. Classroom management

M - 3.42 SD - 1.01

33. Evaluation of students

M - 3.53 SD - .83

34. Communicating skills

M - 3.78 SD - .86

Please rate, for questions 35-37, the emphasis you place on these learnings for your students.

Use the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
very little emphasis	a little	some	much	very much emphasis

35. Cognitive (subject or factual knowledge)

M - 3.85 SD - .79

36. Interpersonal (knowledge about their interactions and relationships with others)

M - 4.22 SD - .81

37. Personal (knowledge about themselves)

M - 4.18 SD - .85

Please rate, for questions 37-47, the degree to which you are demonstrating, experiencing, or observing the following in your present teaching position.

Use the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6
very little	a little	some	much	very much	no opportunity

38. Discussing and dealing with issues of racism

M - 2.60 SD - 1.44

39. Discussing and dealing with issues of sexism

M - 2.63 SD - 1.34

40. Feeling success in teaching students of different economic, cultural and social backgrounds

M - 3.53 SD - 1.22

41. Meeting your student's individual needs and concerns through your teaching

M - 4.19 SD - .98

42. Involved in bringing about changes in school, community, and society in general

M - 2.86 SD - 1.34

43. Evaluating yourself and your teaching

M - 4.12 SD - .97

44. Feeling confident as a teacher and prepared to cope with your present situation

M - 4.18 SD - .91

45. Giving your students decision-making power to set their goals and choose the methods to reach those goals

M - 3.30 SD - 1.27

46. Teaching in accordance with the educational beliefs of your preparation program

M - 3.32 SD - 1.23

47. Perceive that most teachers and administrators in your school tolerate the educational beliefs concerning teaching encouraged by your preparation program

M - 3.25 SD - 1.40

For those not teaching, please circle the most appropriate response below:

48. (1) I decided I don't want to teach at this time. (16%)

(2) I want to teach, but could not find a position or could not find one I was willing to accept. (25%)

(3) I decided to go to graduate school. (6%)

Other (53%)

Table B Questionnaire Response Returns from Each Program

	Number of Mailings	Number of Returns	Percentage of Returns
Amherst Elementary	63	29	46
Bilingual/Bicultural	6	2	33
Cooperative Education	13	5	38
Explorations	43	12	27
Future Studies	17	10	58
Horizons	24	6	25
International Education	24	5	20
METEP	57	24	42
Off Campus	104	44	42
Omnibus	4	3	75
Eleven Plus	21	10	47
Reading	40	20	50
Secondary English	29	12	41
Secondary Science	32	15	46
Secondary Math	26	14	53
Secondary Social Studies	26	12	46
TASP	23	8	34
TEPAM	39	24	61
Urban Education	42	20	47

Table C High and Low Rated* Preservice Variables (Total Sample)

High	Low
Undergraduate Experiences (M=3.86)	Foundations (M=2.95)
Student Teaching (M=4.43)	Cognitive Knowledge (M=2.79)
Communication Skills (M=3.47)	Racism (M=2.84)
Supervision from Local School (M=4.16)	Sexism (M=2.75)
Overall Quality of TEC Program (M=3.48)	Help Selecting Program (M=2.43)
Interpersonal Knowledge (M=3.64)	
Individual Students (M=3.65)	
Decision-Making Powers (M=3.63)	
Self-Evaluation (M=3.61)	

* With a range of 1 to 5 for total mean scores, high is 3.5 to 5.0, and low is 1.0 to 2.99. There are 14 variables falling in the middle range.

Table D High Rated* Preservice Variables by Programs

	Items	4 Undergrad. Experience	5 Methods	6 Educ. Psychology	7 Foundations	8 Student Teaching	9 Lesson Planning	10 Classroom Management	11 Learner Evaluation	12 Communication Skills	13 Supervision-Umass
Amherst Elem.	N=28	X	X			X					
Explorations	N=12	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	
Future Studies	N=10			X	X	X					
METEP	N=22	X	X	X	X	X					X
Off Campus	N=44	X				X					
Eleven Plus	N=10	X	X	X		X		X		X	
Reading	N=20	X		X		X					
Sec. English	N=12	X			X	X		X		X	X
Sec. Science	N=14	X				X	X	X			X
Sec. Math	N=15	X				X					X
Sec. Soc. Studies	N=12	X		X		X	X	X		X	X
TASP	N=8	X			X	X	X	X		X	X
TEPAM	N=24	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Urban Education	N=20	X				X	X	X	X	X	
TOTAL		13	5	7	4	14	6	8	2	7	7

* Where 50% or more responses fell into the good/excellent parts of item scales.

	14 Local Supervision	15 Quality of TEC	16 Cognitive Knowledge	17 Interpersonal Knowledge	18 Personal Knowledge	19 Racism	20 Sexism	21 Social Change	22 Various Backgrounds	23 Individual Differences	24 Support
Amherst Elem.	X	X									
Explorations	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Future Studies	X	X						X		X	
METEP	X	X		X						X	X
Off Campus	X			X						X	
Eleven Plus	X	X		X	X					X	X
Reading	X									X	
Sec. English	X	X		X	X					X	X
Sec. Science	X	X									
Sec. Math	X										
Sec. Social Studies	X	X									
TASP	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X
TEPAM	X	X		X	X	X			X	X	X
Urban Education	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
TOTAL	14	11	1	8	6	3	2	4	4	10	6

	25 Theory and Practice	26 Decision-Making Power	27 Self-Evaluation	28 Beliefs and Goals TEC	29 Selecting Program	Total
Amherst Elem.		X				6
Explorations	X	X	X	X	X	23
Future Studies		X	X			9
METEP	X	X	X	X		15
Off Campus						5
Eleven Plus	X	X	X	X	X	17
Reading		X	X	X		8
Sec. English			X	X		14
Sec. Science						7
Sec. Math						4
Sec. Social Studies			X			10
TASP	X	X	X	X		20
TEPAM	X	X	X	X		21
Urban Education		X	X	X		17
TOTAL	5	9	10	8	2	176

Table E Low Rated* Preservice Variables by Programs

	Items	4 Undergrad. Experience	5 Methods	6 Educ. Psychology	7 Foundations	8 Student Teaching	9 Lesson Planning	10 Classroom Management	11 Learner Evaluation	12 Communication Skills	13 Supervision-UMass
Amherst Elem.	N=28										
Explorations	N=12										
Future Studies	N=10										
METEP	N=22										
Off Campus	N=44				X						X
Eleven Plus	N=10										
Reading	N=20										X
Sec. English	N=12										
Sec. Science	N=14										
Sec. Math	N=15				X				X		
Sec. Soc. Studies	N=12										
TASP	N=8										
TEPAM	N=24										
Urban Education	N=20										
TOTAL					2				1		2

* Where 50% or more responses fell into the very poor/poor parts of item scales.

	14 Local Supervision	15 Quality of TEC	16 Cognitive Knowledge	17 Interpersonal Knowledge	18 Personal Knowledge	19 Racism	20 Sexism	21 Social Change	22 Various Backgrounds	23 Individual Differences	24 Support
Amherst Elem.						X	X	X	X		
Explorations											
Future Studies						X	X		X		
METEP											
Off Campus			X			X					
Eleven Plus											
Reading					X			X			
Sec. English						X					
Sec. Science						X	X	X	X		
Sec. Math								X	X	X	
Sec. Social Studies			X		X	X	X				
TASP											
TEPAM											
Urban Education											
TOTAL			2		2	6	4	4	4	1	

	25 Theory and Practice	26 Decision-Making Power	27 Self-Evaluation	28 Beliefs and Goals TEC	29 Selecting Program		Total
Amherst Elem.					X		5
Explorations							0
Future Studies	X						4
METEP							0
Off Campus	X				X		6
Eleven Plus							0
Reading					X		4
Sec. English					X		2
Sec. Science							4
Sec. Math				X	X		7
Sec. Social Studies	X				X		6
TASP					X		1
TEPAM					X		1
Urban Education							0
TOTAL	3			1	8		40

Table F Comparison* of Programs** on All Variables (in Percentages)

	Preservice Items	4 Undergrad. Experience	5 Methods	6 Educ. Psychology	7 Foundations	8 Student Teaching	9 Lesson Planning	10 Classroom Management	11 Learner Evaluation	12 Communication Skills
Amherst Elem.	N=28	-10.4	+12.6	-11.5	-3.7	-2.4	+3.6	-14.9	-19.2	-12.8
Explorations	N=12	+5.0	+22.6	+44.2	+6.7	+0.8	+19.2	+24.3	+1.6	+22.9
Future Studies	N=10	-38.3	+2.6	+12.5	+16.7	-10.9	-4.4	-12.4	+6.0	-5.4
METEP	N=22	+2.7	+21.7	+5.1	+16.7	+4.3	+3.2	-13.9	+2.5	-4.8
Off Campus	N=44	-3.3	-14.3	-3.3	-9.5	+2.3	-23.9	-16.8	-6.7	-7.3
Eleven Plus	N=10	+21.7	+22.6	+2.5	-3.3	-2.0	-30.1	+16.8	-5.1	+16.9
Reading	N=20	-15.1	-2.4	+19.2	-7.0	-5.9	-15.0	-12.4	-6.8	-14.5
Sec. English	N=12	+13.4	-12.4	-21.3	+16.7	-9.1	-11.1	+4.3	-0.9	+12.7
Sec. Science	N=14	+0.3	-23.1	-18.9	-11.9	-9.1	+5.6	+8.8	-2.0	-31.6
Sec. Math	N=15	+1.7	+2.6	-27.5	-26.6	-4.2	-4.4	-4.0	-13.4	-11.3
Sec. Soc. Studies	N=12	+13.4	-29.4	+10.8	0.0	+9.1	+5.6	+9.9	+6.0	+5.8
TASP	N=8	-3.3	+0.1	-18.9	+23.8	+9.1	+18.1	+25.7	-5.1	+25.2
TEPAM	N=24	+13.4	+12.6	+23.3	+5.8	+9.1	+34.8	+29.3	+32.4	+29.4
Urban Education	N=20	+6.7	-11.1	-14.2	+11.1	-0.9	+5.6	+9.3	+11.6	+2.8
Level of Significance (Chi Square)		.06	.008	.03	.03		.009	.03	.03	.006

* The percentages for each program are above or below the total average of these programs using responses in the good/excellent part of item scales.

** Includes programs with an N=8 or more for preservice variables.

	13 Supervision-UMass	14 Local Supervision	15 Quality of TEC	16 Cognitive Knowledge	17 Interpersonal Knowledge	18 Personal Knowledge	19 Racism	20 Sexism	21 Social Change
Amherst Elem.	-2.3	-6.9	+3.6	-19.2	-14.1	-0.5	-27.0	-19.5	-33.6
Explorations	-5.0	+11.7	+9.5	+27.1	+33.2	+34.7	+52.7	+56.7	+46.1
Future Studies	-6.7	+10.0	-4.1	+14.6	-14.1	-23.6	-19.5	-26.6	+18.4
METEP	+13.3	0.0	+18.6	-18.4	+14.2	-3.1	+5.8	+14.3	-5.4
Off Campus	-28.5	-0.9	-20.0	-4.7	-4.0	-7.7	-17.0	-8.4	+1.4
Eleven Plus	-24.5	+8.9	+1.5	-12.9	+21.5	+31.4	+9.4	+13.4	+2.8
Reading	-34.2	-6.3	-24.1	+2.1	-28.5	-28.6	-10.6	-16.6	-7.2
Sec. English	+33.3	-7.3	+0.4	+7.1	+21.5	+31.4	+9.4	+13.4	-7.2
Sec. Science	+20.0	-21.7	-4.1	+20.0	-37.1	-34.3	-30.6	-26.6	-30.1
Sec. Math	+6.6	-6.7	-20.8	-1.5	-29.9	-20.0	-3.9	+0.1	-30.5
Sec. Soc. Studies	+33.3	+20.0	+12.6	+2.1	-33.5	-23.6	-30.6	-18.3	-12.2
TASP	+28.3	+7.5	+33.4	+2.1	+41.5	+26.4	+6.9	+23.4	+62.8
TEPAM	+15.8	+3.3	+33.4	+14.6	+29.0	+22.2	+23.6	+15.1	+8.6
Urban Education	+0.7	+5.0	-4.1	+2.1	+21.5	+21.4	+59.4	+13.4	+41.7
Level of Significance (Chi Square)	.0005		.02	.08	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000

	22 Various Backgrounds	23 Individual Differences	24 Support	25 Theory and Practice	26 Decision-Making Power	27 Self-Evaluation	28 Beliefs and Goals TEC	29 Selecting Program
Amherst Elem.	-25.6	-24.0	-1.2	-7.3	-7.7	-8.6	-22.7	-14.5
Explorations	+38.7	+15.3	+19.1	+22.4	+42.7	+43.3	+8.7	+28.4
Future Studies	-25.2	-4.1	-7.6	+4.1	-7.7	-6.7	-19.6	+0.6
METEP	-18.1	+31.2	+6.9	+18.6	+5.9	+2.4	+36.8	+11.7
Off Campus	+11.4	-5.2	-20.3	-24.5	-14.5	-11.2	-16.3	-5.7
Eleven Plus	-6.3	+20.3	+32.4	+14.1	+12.3	+13.3	+0.4	+38.4
Reading	-11.3	+5.3	-7.6	-0.9	+10.7	-4.1	+3.0	-5.8
Sec. English	-16.3	+0.3	+16.0	+9.6	-12.3	-2.2	+4.9	+5.7
Sec. Science	-29.2	-45.4	-11.9	+2.6	-11.5	-18.2	-3.4	+7.0
Sec. Math	-29.6	-33.0	-27.6	-15.9	-17.7	-21.0	-22.9	-14.9
Sec. Soc. Studies	+5.4	-18.0	-14.3	-10.9	-24.4	-6.7	-16.3	+3.4
TASP	+26.2	+27.8	+27.4	+39.1	+29.8	+0.4	+37.9	-9.1
TEPAM	+22.0	+23.6	+35.7	+26.6	+29.8	+26.6	+17.1	-0.8
Urban Education	+43.7	+15.3	-2.6	-14.8	-7.7	+8.3	+15.4	-1.6
Level of Significance (Chi Square)	.0000	.0000	.003	.0002	.003	.03	.0000	

Inservice Items		31 Lesson Planning	32 Classroom Management	33 Evaluation of Students	34 Communication Skills	35 Cognitive Knowledge	36 Interpersonal Knowledge	37 Personal Knowledge	38 Racism	39 Sexism
Amherst Elem.	N=19	-7.7	+7.1	-5.4	-14.8	+1.3	+11.9	+4.5	-9.3	-9.6
Explorations	N=7	+42.7	+34.9	+18.6	+23.5	-1.0	+17.2	+20.3	+57.3	+60.7
Future Studies	N=5	+23.7	+15.9	+13.9	+12.8	-5.7	-7.8	-4.7	-1.0	0.0
METEP	N=12	+2.5	-23.5	+1.7	+1.4	-5.7	-7.8	+3.3	-7.8	-6.8
Off Campus	N=20	-16.7	+7.1	-10.7	-4.4	-12.4	-2.5	-4.7	+11.5	+6.3
Eleven Plus	N=4	-9.7	-0.8	-19.5	+12.8	+27.6	+17.2	-4.7	+7.3	-25.0
Reading	N=15	-3.0	+6.3	-12.8	-2.2	+6.2	-25.7	-15.7	-3.8	-2.8
Sec. English	N=7	+14.1	+6.3	+30.5	+37.8	-1.0	+17.2	+20.3	+16.9	+17.9
Sec. Science	N=5	-18.0	-10.8	+22.2	-22.2	+7.6	+17.2	+0.3	-26.0	-5.0
Sec. Math	N=8	+7.0	-50.8	-2.8	-24.7	+15.1	-32.8	-17.2	-1.0	-12.5
Sec. Soc. Studies	N=1	+57.0	+49.2	-52.8	+37.8	+27.6	+17.2			
TASP	N=4	-18.0	-0.8	-27.8	+12.8	-47.4	+17.2	+20.3	-26.0	+25.0
TEPAM	N=12	+15.3	-5.3	+30.5	+4.5	+19.3	+8.9	+3.6	-26.0	-25.0
Urban Education	N=12	-13.0	+3.7	-7.3	+1.4	-8.8	-1.0	+2.1	+1.3	-8.3
Level of Significance (Chi Square)									.03	.07

	40 Various Backgrounds	41 Individual Students	42 Social Change	43 Evaluating Teaching	44 Confidence	45 Pupil Decision Power	46 Beliefs and Goals TEC	47 School's Beliefs TEC
Amherst Elem.	-0.3	+11.7	+4.7	+2.0	+7.7	+2.2	-5.4	+3.3
Explorations	+29.2	+7.9	+45.3	+8.8	+22.7	+45.0	+38.2	+0.4
Future Studies	+5.9	-2.8	+13.9	+3.1	-17.3	+19.3	-47.5	-49.6
METEP	-20.8	-11.1	-17.8	-4.2	-4.6	+13.8	+7.0	+4.9
Off Campus	-1.5	+7.2	+1.7	-5.5	-2.3	-9.1	-12.2	-12.1
Eleven Plus	-4.1	-11.1	-26.1	-1.9	+22.7	-40.7	+2.5	+17.1
Reading	+10.2	+2.2	-26.1	-3.6	-10.6	-15.7	+5.8	+17.1
Sec. English	+3.0	-6.4	+31.0	+24.1	-5.9	+26.0	+23.9	+30.4
Sec. Science	-14.1	+2.2	-6.1	+3.1	-17.3	-20.7	+12.5	+25.4
Sec. Math	-25.5	-27.8	-11.8	-14.4	+8.4	-28.2	-22.5	+0.4
Sec. Soc. Studies	+45.9	+22.2	-26.1	+23.1	+22.7	+59.3		-49.6
TASP	+12.6	+22.2	-1.0	+23.1	+22.7	+34.3	+2.5	+0.4
TEPAM	-20.8	+2.2	-11.8	-13.3	+2.7	-15.7	-12.2	-16.3
Urban Education	+18.6	-14.2	+13.9	+7.4	-10.6	-0.7	+12.5	-13.2
Level of Significance (Chi Square)								

Table G Summary of Comparisons Among Programs on 26 Preservice Variables

	Comparison from zero (from Table F)				50% or more Responses (from Tables D,E)	
	+15%	-15%	Total +'s	Total -'s	High	Low
Amherst Elementary	0	8	3	23	6	5
Explorations	18	0	25	1	23	0
Future Studies	2	6	9	17	9	4
METEP	6	2	19	6	15	0
Off Campus	0	8	3	23	5	6
Eleven Plus	9	2	19	7	17	0
Reading	1	7	5	21	8	4
Secondary English	5	2	16	10	14	2
Secondary Science	2	12	7	19	7	4
Secondary Math	0	13	4	22	4	7
Secondary Soc. Stud.	2	8	13	12	10	6
TASP	16	1	22	4	20	1
TEPAM	18	0	25	1	21	1
Urban Education	7	0	18	8	17	0

Table H Employment Status Among All Programs (in Percentages)

		Full Time	Part Time or Paraprof.	Non-Sch. Teaching	Education but Not. Teach.	Grad. School	Other
Amherst Elem.	N=26	46	19	4	4	4	23
Bilingual/Bicul.	N=2	100					
Cooperative Ed.	N=5	20	20		20		40
Explorations	N=12	8	33		17	17	25
Future Studies	N=10	20	10	10		10	50
Horizons	N=6	17	17			33	33
International Ed.	N=5	20	20				60
METEP	N=22	27	27		5		41
Off Campus	N=44	16	25	2	11	11	34
Omnibus	N=3					33	67
Eleven Plus	N=10	20	20			10	50
Reading	N=18	50	39				11
Sec. English	N=12	50	8				42
Sec. Science	N=14	29	7			21	43
Sec. Math	N=14	50	7				43
Sec. Soc. Studies	N=12		8		17	17	58
TASP	N=8	25	25				50
TEPAM	N=24	29	17			8	46
Urban Ed.	N=20	15	30	15	5	5	30